

E680

G23

Copy 2

182

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 013 789 571 7

permalife®
pH 8.5

Can the Democratic Party be Safely Intrusted with the
Administration of the Government?

SPEECH OF

HON. JAMES A. GARFIELD,
OF OHIO,

In the House of Representatives, Friday, August 4, 1876.

The House is in a Committee of the Whole on the bill (H. R. No. 252) to transfer the conduct of Indian affairs from the Interior Department to the War Department—

Mr. GARFIELD said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I regret that the speech of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LAMAR] has not yet appeared in the Record, so that I might have had its full and authentic text before offering my own remarks in reply. But his propositions were so clearly and so very ably stated, the doctrines that ran through it were so logically connected, it will be my own fault if I fail to understand and appreciate the general scope and purpose of his speech.

In the outset, I desire for myself and for a majority, at least, of those for whom I speak, to express my gratitudo to the gentleman for all that portion of his speech which had for its object the removal of the prejudices and unkindly feelings that have arisen among citizens of the Republic, in consequence of the late war. Whatever faults the speech may have, its author expresses an earnest desire to make progress in the direction of a better understanding between the North and the South; and in that it meets my most hearty concurrence and approval.

I will attempt to state briefly what I understand to be the logic of the gentleman's speech. He sets out with deplored the evils of party, and expressing the belief that the great mass of the American people are tired of much that belongs to party; and, looking beyond and above mere party prejudices and passions, they greatly desire to remove public corruptions, and reform the manifold errors and evils of administration and legislation; that those errors and evils consist mainly of two things: First, of a generally corrupt state of public administration; and second, of a deplorable state of the civil service; that this state of affairs is buttressed and maintained by an enormous army of 100,000 civil office-holders and 100,000 more expectants for office; and that because of

this vast force the people have hitherto been unable to make the reforms they desire. This is his major premise.

The next point, his minor premise, is that the Republican party is incapable of effecting the great reforms which the people desire; and his conclusion from these premises is that the Democratic party ought to be brought into power in the coming election.

This was the summary, and, I may say, abrupt, conclusion of his reasoning. The gentleman seemed to be aware that there might be some apprehensions in the minds of the people that it would not, quite yet, be safe to recall the Democratic party to power; and he endeavored to quiet those apprehensions by stating in the first place that there need be no fear that the South, lately in rebellion, would again control the Government; that they were prostrated; that their institutions had been overthrown; that their industries had been broken up; that in their weak and broken condition there need be no fear that they would again be placed at the head of public affairs; and, finally, that the South has united with the Democratic party not from choice, but forced to it by inexorable necessity as their only means of protection.

In the second place, there was apprehension, he said, that the Democracy, if they came into power, would not preserve the beneficent results of the war. But he assures us that this fear is groundless; that the people of the South have no aspirations which are not bounded by the horizon of the Union; that they, as well as the Democracy of the North, except, honestly and sincerely, the great results of the war; and that they can be trusted to preserve all the good that has been gained.

Again he says it is feared, on the part of many, that the colored race, lately enslaved, will not be safe in the full enjoyment of all the rights resulting from the war and guaranteed by the amendments to the Constitution. This he also assures us is a groundless

7-2
July 2

less fear, because the people of the South understand the colored race, appreciate their qualities, and are on such a footing of friendship and regard that they are in fact better fitted to meet the wants of that people and help them along in the way of civilization, enlightenment, and peace, than those who are further removed from such knowledge.

He emphasizes the statement that the South cheerfully accepts the results of the war; and admits that that much good has been achieved by the Republican party, which ought to be preserved. I was gratified to hear the gentleman speak of Lincoln as "the illustrious author of the great act of emancipation." That admission will be welcomed everywhere by those who believe in the justice and wisdom of that great act. While speaking of the condition of the South and its wants he deplores two evils which afflict that portion of our country: First, Federal supervision; and second, negro ascendancy in its political affairs. In that connection, it will be remembered, he quoted from John Stuart Mill and from Gibbon; the one, to show that the most deplorable form of government is where the slave governs; and from the other, to show the evils of a government which is in alien hands. The gentleman represented the South as suffering the composite evils depicted by both these great writers. That I may be sure to do him justice I quote a paragraph from the Associated Press report of his speech:

The inevitable effect of that reconstruction policy had been to draw one race to its support and drive the other race to its opposition. He quoted Gibbon, the historian, as saying that the most absurd and oppressive system of government which could be conceived of is that which subjects the native of a country to the domination of his slave. He also quoted from John Stuart Mill to the effect that when a government is administered by rulers not responsible to the people governed, but to some other community, it is one of the worst of conceivable governments, and he said that the hideous system established in the South is a composite of those two vicious systems. The people are subjected to the domination of their former slaves, and are ruled over by people whose constituents were not the people for whom they should act, but the Federal Government.

Now, I have stated—of course very briefly, but I hope with entire fairness—the scope of the very able speech to which we listened. In a word it is this: the Republican party is oppressing the South; negro suffrage is a grievous evil; there are serious corruptions in public affairs in the national legislation and Administration; the civil service of the country especially needs great and radical reform; and therefore the Democratic party ought to be placed in control of the Government at this time by the election of Tilden and Hendricks.

It has not been my habit, and it is not my desire, to discuss mere party politics in this great legislative forum. And I shall do so

now only in so far as a fair review of the gentleman's speech requires. My remarks shall be responsive to his; and I shall discuss party history and party policy only as the logic of his speech leads into that domain.

From most of the premises of the gentleman, as matters of fact and history, I dissent; some of them are undoubtedly correct. But, for the sake of argument only, admitting that all his premises are correct, I deny that his conclusion is warranted by his premises; and, before I close I shall attempt to show that the good he seeks cannot be secured by the ascendancy of the Democratic party at this time.

Before entering upon that field, however, I must notice this remarkable omission in the logic of his speech. Although he did state that the country might consider itself free from some of the dangers which are apprehended as the result of Democratic ascendancy, he did not, as I remember, by any word attempt to prove the fitness of the Democracy as a political organization to accomplish the reforms which he so much desires; and without that affirmative proof of fitness his argument is necessarily an absolute failure.

It is precisely that fear which has not only made the ascendancy of the Democratic party so long impossible, but has made it incompetent to render that service so necessary to good government—the service of maintaining the position of a wise and honorable opposition to the dominant party. Often the blunders and faults of the Republican party have been condoned by the people because of the violent, reactionary, and disloyal spirit of the Democracy.

He tells us that is one of the well-known lessons of political history and philosophy; that the opposition party comes in to preserve and crystallize the measures which their antagonists inaugurated; and that a conservative opposition party is better fitted to accomplish such a work than an aggressive radical party who roughly pioneered the way and brought in the changes. And to apply this maxim to our own situation he tells us that the differences between the Republican and Democratic parties upon the issues which led to the war and those which grew out of it, were rather differences of time than of substance; that the Democracy followed more slowly in the Republican path, but have at last arrived by prudent and constitutional methods at the same results; and hence they will be sure to guard securely and cherish faithfully what the Republicans gained by reckless and turbulent methods. There is some truth in these "glittering generalities," but, as applied to our present situation, they are entitled only to the consideration which we give to the bright but fantastic pictures of a Utopian dream.

I share all that gentleman's aspirations

for peace, for good government at the South; and I believe I can safely assure him that the great majority of the nation shares the same aspirations. But he will allow me to say that he has not fully stated the elements of the great problem to be solved by the statesmanship of to-day. The actual field is much broader than the view he has taken. And before we can agree that the remedy he proposes is an adequate one, we must take in the whole field, comprehend all the conditions of the problem, and then see if his remedy is sufficient. The change he proposes is not like the ordinary change of a ministry in England when the Government is defeated on a tax bill or some routine measure of legislation. He proposes to turn over to the custody and management of the Government to a party which has persistently and with the greatest bitterness resisted all the great changes of the last fifteen years, changes which were the necessary results of a vast revolution—a revolution in national policy, in social and political ideas—a revolution whose causes were not the work of a day nor of a year, but of generations and centuries. The scope and character of that mighty revolution must form the basis of our judgment when we inquire whether such a change as he proposes is safe and wise.

In discussing his proposition we must not forget that as the result of this revolution the South, after the great devastations of war, the great loss of life and treasure, the overthrow of its social and industrial system, was called upon to confront the new and difficult problem of two races; one just released from centuries of slavery, and the other a cultivated, brave, proud, imperious race, to be brought together on terms of equality before the law. New, difficult, delicate, and dangerous questions bristle out from every point of that problem.

But that is not all of the situation. On the other hand, we see the North, after leaving its 350,000 dead upon the field of battle and bringing home its 500,000 maimed and wounded to be cared for, crippled in its industries, staggering under the tremendous burden of public and private debt, and both North and South weighted with unparalleled burdens and losses—the whole nation suffering from that loosening of the bonds of social order which always follows a great war and from the resulting corruption both in the public and the private life of the people. These, Mr. Chairman, constitute the vast field which you must survey in order to find the path which will soonest lead our beloved country to the highway of peace, of liberty, and prosperity. Peace from the shock of battle; the higher peace of our streets, of our homes, of our equal rights we must make secure by making the conquering ideas of the war everywhere dominant and permanent.

With all my heart I join with the gentleman in rejoicing that—

The war-drums throb no longer and the battle-flags are furled,

and I look forward with joy and hope to the day when our brave people, one in heart, one in their aspirations for freedom and peace, shall see that the darkness through which we have traveled was a part of that stern but beneficent discipline by which the Great Disposer of events has been leading us on to a higher and nobler national life.

But such a result can be reached only by comprehending the whole meaning of the revolution through which we have passed and are still passing. I say still passing; for I remember that after the battle of arms comes the battle of history. The cause that triumphs in the field does not always triumph in history. And those who carried the war for union and equal and universal freedom to a victorious issue can never safely relax their vigilance until the ideas for which they fought have become embodied in the enduring forms of individual and national life.

Has this been done? Not yet.

I ask the gentleman in all plainness of speech, and yet in all kindness, is he correct in his statement that the conquered party accept the results of the war? Even if they do I remind the gentleman that *accept* is not a very strong word. I go further. I ask him if the Democratic party have *adopted* the results of the war? Is it not asking too much of human nature to expect such unparalleled changes to be not only accepted, but, in so short a time, adopted by men of strong and independent opinions?

The antagonisms which gave rise to the war and grew out of it were not born in a day, nor can they vanish in a night.

Mr. Chairman, great ideas travel slowly, and for a time noiselessly as the gods whose feet were shod with wool. Our war of independence was a war of ideas, of ideas evolved out of two hundred years of slow and silent growth. When, one hundred years ago, our fathers announced as self-evident truths the declaration that all men are created equal, and the only just power of governments is derived from the consent of the governed, they uttered a doctrine that no nation had ever adopted, that not one kingdom on the earth then believed. Yet to our fathers it was so plain that they would not debate it. They announced it as a truth “self-evident.”

Whence came the immortal truths of the Declaration? To me this was, for years, the riddle of our history. I have searched long and patiently through the books of the *doctrinaires* to find the germs from which the Declaration of Independence sprang. I found hints in Locke, in Hobbes, in Rousseau, and

Fenelon; but they were only the hints of dreamers and philosophers. The great doctrines of the Declaration germinated in the hearts of our fathers, and were developed under the new influences of this wilderness world, by the same subtle mystery which brings forth the rose from the germ of the rose-tree. Unconsciously to themselves, the great truths were growing under the new conditions until, like the century plant, they blossomed into the matchless beauty of the Declaration of Independence, whose fruitage, increased and increasing, we enjoy to-day.

It will not do, Mr. Chairman, to speak of the gigantic revolution through which we have lately passed as a thing to be adjusted and settled by a change of administration. It was cyclical, epochal, century-wide, and to be studied in its broad and grand perspective—a revolution of even wider scope, so far as time is concerned, than the Revolution of 1776. We have been dealing with elements and forces which have been at work on this continent more than two hundred and fifty years. I trust I shall be excused if I take a few moments to trace some of the leading phases of the great struggle. And in doing so, I beg gentlemen to see that the subject itself lifts us into a region where the individual sinks out of sight and is absorbed in the mighty current of great events. It is not the occasion to award praise or pronounce condemnation. In such a revolution men are like insects, that fret and toss in the storm, but are swept onward by the resistless movements of elements beyond their control. I speak of this revolution not to praise the men who aided it, nor to censure the men who resisted it, but as a force to be studied, as a mandate to be obeyed.

In the year 1620 there were planted, upon this continent, two ideas irreconcilably hostile to each other. Ideas are the great warriors of the world; and a war that has no ideas behind it is simply brutality. The two ideas were landed, one at Plymouth Rock from the Mayflower, and the other from a Dutch brig, at Jamestown, Virginia. One was the old doctrine of Luther, that private judgment in politics as well as religion is the right and duty of every man; and the other that capital should own labor, that the negro had no rights of manhood, and the white man might justly buy, own, and sell him and his offspring forever. Thus freedom and equality on the one hand, and on the other the slavery of one race and the denigration of another, were the two germs planted on this continent. In our vast expanse of wilderness, for a long time, there was room for both, and their advocates began the race across the continent, each developing the social and political institutions of their choice. Both had vast interests in common; and for a long time neither was

conscious of the fatal antagonisms that were developing.

For nearly two centuries there was no serious collision; but when the continent began to fill up, and the people began to jostle against each other: when the Round-head and the Cavalier came near enough to measure opinions, the irreconcilable character of the two doctrines began to appear. Many conscientious men studied the subject, and came to the belief that slavery was a crime, a sin, or as Wesley said, "the sum of all villainies." This belief dwelt in small minorities for a long time. It lived in the churches and vestries, but later found its way into the civil and political organizations of the country, and finally found its way into this Chamber. A few brave, clear-sighted, far-seeing men announced it here a little more than a generation ago. A predecessor of mine, Joshua R. Giddings, following the lead of John Quincy Adams of Massachusetts, almost alone, held up the banner on this floor, and, from year to year, comrades came to his side. Through evil and through good report he pressed the question upon the conscience of the nation; and bravely stood in his place in this House, until his white locks, like the plume of Henry of Navarre, showed where the battle for freedom raged most fiercely.

And so the contest continued: the supporters of slavery believing honestly and sincerely that slavery was a divine institution; that it found its high sanctions in the living oracles of God and in a wise political philosophy; that it was justified by the necessities of their situation; and that slaveholders were missionaries to the dark sons of Africa, to elevate and bless them. We are so far past the passions of that early time that we can now study the progress of the struggle as a great and inevitable development, without sharing in the crimination and recrimination that attended it. If both sides could have seen that it was a contest beyond their control: if both parties could have realized the truth that "unsettled questions have no pity for the repose of nations," much less for the fate of political parties, the bitterness, the sorrow, the tears, and the blood might have been avoided. But we walked in the darkness, our paths obscured by the smoke of the conflict, each following his own convictions through ever-increasing fierceness, until the debate culminated in "the last argument to which kings resort."

This conflict of opinion was not merely one of sentimental feeling; it involved our whole political system; it gave rise to two radically different theories of the nature of our Government: the North believing and holding that we were a nation, the South insisting that we were only a confederation of sovereign States, and insisting that each State had the right, at its own discretion, to

break the Union, and constantly threatening secession, where the full rights of slavery were not acknowledged.

Thus the defense and aggrandizement of slavery and the hatred of abolitionism became not only the central idea of the Democratic party, but its master passion; a passion intensified and inflamed by twenty-five years of fierce political contest, which had not only driven from its ranks all those who preferred freedom to slavery, but had absorbed all the extreme pro slavery elements of the fallen Whig party. Over against this was arrayed the Republican party, asserting the broad doctrines of nationality and loyalty, insisting that no State had a right to secede, that secession was treason, and demanding that the institution of slavery should be restricted to the limits of the States where it already existed. But here and there many bolder and more radical thinkers declared, with Wendell Phillips, that there never could be union and peace, freedom and prosperity until we were willing to see John Hancock under a black skin.

That we may see more clearly the opinions which were to be settled by war I will read two passages from the Congressional Globe, not for the purpose of making a personal point against any man, but simply to show where honest men stood when that contest was approaching its crisis. I read from a speech made on the 19th day of December, 1859, by the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, [Mr. SINGLETON,] then and now a member of this House:

The South will never submit to that state of things. It matters not what evils come upon us; it matters not how deep we have to wade through blood; we are bound to keep our slaves in their present position. And let me ask you, what good would you bring to the slaves by this process of abolition? You may possibly have the object in view of benefiting the slave or benefiting the white race or both; but suppose you could carry out your plans and confine us to our present area, and suppose that the institution of slavery should abolish itself, what would you have done? You know it is impossible for us to live on terms of equality with them. It is not to be supposed for a moment that we can do so. The result would be a war between the races, which would perhaps involve the utter annihilation of one or the other; and thus you see that instead of benefiting either you would have brought disaster upon both.

But I tell you here, to-day, that the institution of slavery must be sustained. The South has made up its mind to keep the black race in bondage. If we are not permitted to do this inside of the Union, I tell you that it will be done outside of it. Yes, sir, and we will expand this institution; we do not intend to be confined within our present limits; and there are not men enough in all your borders to coerce three million armed men in the South, and prevent their going into the surrounding Territories.

In the course of that debate the same gentleman said:

I am one of those who have said, and here repeat it, if the black Republican party elect a President I am for dissolving the Union.

I have no doubt the gentleman fairly and

faithfully represented the opinions of his State. Not long before the date of this speech, it will be remembered that two distinguished members of the Republican party had uttered their opinions on this question. Mr. Lincoln had said that it was impossible for a country to remain partly slave and partly free. And Mr. Seward had said that there was an irrepressible conflict between the systems of free and slave labor which could never cease until one or the other was wholly overthrown. The Republican party, however, disclaimed all right or purpose to interfere with slavery in the States; yet they expressed the hope that the time would come when there should be no slave under our flag. In response to that particular opinion the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, [Mr. LAMAR,] then a member of this House, on the 23d day of December, 1859, said this:

I was upon the floor of the Senate when your great leader, William H. Seward, announced that startling programme of anti-slavery sentiment and action. * * * * And, sir, in his exultation he exclaimed—for I heard him myself—that he hoped to see the day when there would not be the foot-print of a single slave upon this continent. And when he uttered this atrocious sentiment, his form seemed to dilate, his pale, thin face, furrowed by the lines of thought and evil passions, kindled with malignant triumph, and his eye glowed and glared upon Southern Senators as though the fires of hell were burning in his heart.

I have read this passage to mark the height to which the antagonism had risen in 1859. And this passage enables us to measure the progress he has since made.

I mark it here as one of the notable signs of the time, that the gulf which intervenes between the position then occupied by the gentleman from Mississippi and the position he occupies to-day is so deep, so vast, that it indicates a progress worthy of all praise. I congratulate him and the country that, in so short a time, so great a change has been possible.

Now I ask the gentleman if he is quite sure, as a matter of fact, that the Democratic party, its Southern as well as its Northern wing, have followed his own illustrious and worthy example in the vast progress he has made since 1859? He assures us that the transformation has been so complete that the nation can safely trust all the most precious fruits of the war in the hands of that party who stood with him in 1858. If that be true, I rejoice at it with all my heart; but the gentleman must pardon me if I ask him to assist my wavering faith by some evidence, some consoling proofs. When did the great transformation take place? Certainly not within two years after the delivery of the speech I have quoted; for two years from that time the contest had risen much higher; it had risen to the point of open, terrible, and determined war. Did the change come during the war? O, no; for in the four terrible years ending in 1865 every resource of

courage and power that the Southern States could muster was employed not only to save slavery but to destroy the Union. So the transformation had not occurred in 1865. When did it occur? Aid our anxious inquiry, for the nation ought to be sure that the great change has occurred before it can safely trust its destinies to the Democratic party. Did it occur in the first epoch of reconstruction—the two years immediately following the war? During that period the attempt was made to restore governments in the South on the basis of the white vote. Military control was held generally; but the white population of the Southern States were invited to elect their own Legislatures and establish provisional governments.

In the laws, covering a period of two and a half years, 1865, 1866, and a portion of 1867, enacted by those Legislatures, we ought to find proof of the transformation if it had then occurred. What do we find? What we should naturally expect: that a people, accustomed to the domination of slavery, re-enacted in almost all of the Southern States, and notably in the States of Mississippi and Louisiana, laws limiting and restricting the liberty of the colored man; vagrant laws and peonage laws, whereby negroes were sold at auction for the payment of a paltry tax or fine, and held in a slavery as real as the slavery of other days. I believe that this was true of nearly all of the Southern States; so that the experiment of allowing the white population of the South to adjust that very question proved a frightful failure; and then it was that the National Congress intervened. They proposed an act of reconstruction, an act which became a law on the 2d of March, 1867.

And what was that act? Gentlemen of the South, you are too deeply schooled in philosophy to take any mebrage at what I shall now say, for I am dealing only with history. You must know, and certainly do know, that the great body of the nation which had carried the war to triumph and success knew that the eleven States that had opposed the Union had plunged their people into crime; a crime set down in the law—a law signed by President Washington—at the very top of the catalogue of crimes: the crime of treason and all that follows it. You certainly know that, under that law, every man who voluntarily took up arms against the Union could have been tried, convicted, and hanged as a traitor to his country. But I call your attention to the fact that the conquering nation said, in this great work of reconstruction, "We will do nothing for revenge, everything for permanent peace;" and you know there never was a trial for treason in this country during the whole of the struggle nor after it; no man was executed for treason; no man was tried. There was no expatriation, no exile, no con-

fiscation after the war. The only revenge which the conquering nation gratified was this: In saying to the South "You may come back to your full place in the Union when you do these things: join with the other States in putting into the Constitution a provision that the national debt shall never be repudiated; that your rebel war debt shall never be paid, and that all men, without regard to race or color, shall stand equal before the law; not in suffrage, but in civil rights; that these great guarantees of liberty and public faith shall be lifted above the reach of political parties, above the legislation of States, above the legislation of Congress, and shall be set in the serene firmament of the Constitution, to shine as lights forever and forever. And under that equal sky, under the light of that equal sun, all men, of whatever race or color, shall stand equal before the law."

That was the plan of reconstruction offered to those who had been in rebellion, offered by a generous and brave nation; and I challenge the world to show an act of equal generosity to a conquered people. What answer did it meet? By the advice of Andrew Johnson, a bad adviser, backed by the advice of the Northern Democracy, a still worse adviser, ten of the eleven States lately in rebellion contemptuously rejected the plan of reconstruction embraced in the fourteenth amendment of the Constitution. They would have none of it; they had been invited by their Northern allies to stand out, and were told that when the Democracy came into power they should be permitted to come back to their places without guarantees or conditions.

This brings us to 1868. Had the transformation occurred then? For remember, gentlemen, I am searching for the date of the great transformation similar to that which has taken place in the gentleman from Mississippi. We do not find it in 1868. On the contrary, in that year, we find Frank P. Blair, of Missouri, writing these words, which a few days after they were written gave him the nomination for the Vice-Presidency on the Democratic ticket—

There is but one way to restore government and the Constitution; and that is for the President elect to declare all these acts—

And the constitutional amendment with them—

to declare all these acts null and void, compel the army to undo its usurpations at the South, and disperse the carpet-bag State governments, and allow the white people to reorganize their own governments and elect Senators and Representatives.

Because he wrote that letter he was nominated for Vice-President by the Democratic party. Therefore, as late as July, 1868, the transformation had not occurred.

Had it occurred in 1872? In 1871 and 1872 all the amendments of the Constitution had been adopted, against the stubborn re-

sistance of the Northern and Southern Democracy. I call you to witness that, with the exception of three or four Democratic Representatives who voted for the abolition of slavery, the three great amendments, the thirteenth, the fourteenth, and the fifteenth, met the determined and united opposition of the Democracy of this country. Each of the amendments, now so praised by the gentleman, was adopted against the whole weight of your resistance. And two years after the adoption of the last amendment, in many of your State platforms, they were declared to be null and void.

In 1871 and 1872 occurred throughout the South those dreadful scenes enacted by the Ku Klux organizations, of which I will say only this, that a man *facile princeps* among the Democrats of the slaveholding States, Reverdy Johnson, who was sent down to defend those who were indicted for their crimes, held up his hands in horror at the shocking barbarities that had been perpetrated by his clients upon negro citizens. I refer to the evidence of that eminent man as a sufficient proof of the character of that great conspiracy against the freedom of the colored race. So the transformation had not come in the days of Ku Klux of 1871 and 1872.

Had it come in 1873 and the beginning of 1874? Had it come in the State of Mississippi? Had it come in one after of the States lately in rebellion? Here's a report from an honorable committee of this House, signed by two gentlemen who are still members, Mr. CONGER and Mr. HURLBURG—a report made as late as December, 1874, in which there is disclosed, by innumerable witnesses, the proof that the White Line organization, an armed military organization formed within the Democratic party, had convened themselves together to prevent the enjoyment of suffrage and equal rights by the colored men of the South. Without detaining the House to read them now, I will quote two or three paragraphs from the report, dated December 11, 1874, and printed House Document No. 265.

THE "WHITE LINE."

This latter-day organization has not yet assumed definitely in the State of Mississippi such precise form as to be distinctly existent as in the state of Louisiana, but is unquestionably an extension into Mississippi of the "White League" organization, whose headquarters are in New Orleans. In Warren county it is so commonly called the "White Line," and by that name is familiarly spoken of by the leading papers of Vicksburg, as well as by some of the prominent witnesses before this committee. I should know that "people's clubs" bat in all stages the formation of the clubs or civil organization is accompanied by establishing within the clubs themselves a military organization, officered, equipped, and armed.

Thus the clubs and the tax-payers' league are open associations, apparently directed toward objects in which all citizens might lawfully unite, but controlled from within by the military and partisan organizations whose purposes are special and lawful.

The purposes of these clubs or White Line companies are these, as they are openly avowed or secretly cherished:

1. They are first to make a census and enrollment of all the white men in the State.

2. To incorporate into the interior military organizations all the whites who will join with them.

3. To set aside, by whatever means may be necessary, the election of colored men to office, and to nullify in practice the enabling and enforcement acts of Congress, granting and enforcing the right of all citizens, without distinction of color, to hold offices, if properly elected to them.

4. To allow none but white men to be elected to office or to hold office.

And how was it about the same time, and even later, in other States? Here is a report upon Louisiana, the report from which the gentleman quoted, a report that exhibits the same condition of affairs, signed by the gentleman who sits in front of me, [Mr. HOAR.] Although by a minority of the committee, it is a report of great power and of indubitable truth. I quote from page 18:

The White League is an organization which exists in New Orleans, and contains at least from twenty five hundred to three thousand members, armed, drilled, and officered as a military organization. Organizations bearing the same name extend throughout many parts of the State.

* * * * *

On the 14th of September, 1874, it arose upon and attacked the police of the city, the pretext of the attack being the seizure of arms which it had imported from the North; and having defeated them with considerable slaughter, it took possession of the Statehouse, overthrew the State government, and installed a new governor in office, and kept him in power until the United States interfered. This rising was planned beforehand.

* * * * *

The White League of New Orleans itself was and is a constant menace to the Republicans of the whole State.

* * * * *

We cannot doubt that the effect of all these things was to prevent a full, free, and fair election, and to intimidate the colored voters and the white Republicans.

So the transformation had not occurred in August, 1874. I come down now to 1875, to the late autumn of that year, and ask if the transformation had then occurred. I will not detain the House by reading the testimony of the cloud of witnesses which gathers around me, but will print a few specimens of the proof, most of them relating to the recent State election in Mississippi. While I say, to the honor of the gentleman from Mississippi, that in his own State he spoke against the organization of the White Line, it is unquestionably true that he was not supported by a like action on the part of the great mass of his political associates. With the permission of the House I will quote from a number of papers in his State, which say, with the utmost boldness, that though Col. LAMAR spoke against the White Line, and though the State convention ignored it, yet, back of the convention and back of the gentleman himself, the White Line was formed and carried the election, and intends in the same way to carry the next.

The following quotations need no comment:
 [From the Columbus (Mississippi) Index,
 August, 1875.]

Already do we see signs in our State of the good effects of the color line. Prior to its organization there was no harmony or unity of action among the whites. The negroes had perfected their race in organizations and were able to control the politics of the State. The whites, after having attempted every scheme to secure an intelligent government and a co-operation of the negroes in this behalf, wisely gave it up and determined to organize themselves as a race and meet the issue that had presented itself for ten years.

Now we recognize the fact that the State is most thoroughly aroused, more harmonious in its actions, and more determined to succeed in the coming election than it has been since the days of secession.

* * * * *

So the grand result of the color line has been accomplished in organizing the white people of the State and placing them in a position to control the coming election. No other policy could have effected the result.

[From the Shubuta Times.]

Call it what you please. Some call it the color line. It looks to us like the white line. It shall be seen who in this emergency can choose to stand with the negroes as against the whites. Mark them.

[From the Handborough Democrat.]

We are in favor of the color line as a principle, a necessity, and a policy.

[From the Meridian Mercury.]

Rally on the color line, boys, beyond the platform, every man to his color and colors, and make these negro pretenders to govern this great country to come down, else put 'em down. What do the young men say to the old men's battle-cry in this political campaign, "Step across the platform, boys, and go for 'em."

[From the Forest Register.]

The body of the Democratic party will carry their colors of the White Line over the State. Some of the auxiliaries in a scout or bushwhacking maneuver may use a mild, conservative face over the flag, but still it will rest on a white journal. To the Radicals we say, just superintend your structure; we will raise our own flag and colors.

The Vicksburg Herald, speaking of the Democratic convention of August 9, 1875, says:

The color line was by common consent ignored. It was only mentioned incidentally, and it was "killed off" either by the speech of Col. LAMAR or by a vote of the representatives of the people on the subject. The people expressed no desire to manage its own affairs in its own way.

Speaking of the State, the Columbus Index says: of August 9, 1875, the Col. because it is tacitly indorsed by the platform, of course we believe it to be the only means to rule.

Again, from the same paper:

The necessities of the State of Mississippi recall this injunction and give emphasis to the parallel—put none but Democrats in office.

We have gained a great victory—Bull Run or Chickamauga. Let us follow it up to the securing of results.

The white people must be welded into one compact organization. All differences of opinion, all personal aspirations, must be settled within our own organization, and from its decision there must be no appeal. Otherwise each recurring election produces its disorders.

[From the Meridian Mercury.]

Our correspondent at Running Water Mills makes his points well. His positions cannot successfully be contradicted. The miserable bunglers who have put the negro in the Constitution have certainly written themselves down asses all. When we accept "results of the war," we do not accept the notion of statesmen, but the blunders of unreasoning malice and stupidity, and of course we continue to accept it only so long as we are compelled to.

[From the Jackson Clarion.]

Appeal after appeal has been made in vain to the colored people. No more appeals will be made to them.

[From the Alabama Examiner.]

The present contest is rather a revolution than a political campaign; it is the rebellion, if you see it to apply that term.

[From the Forest Register.]

In this connection we will state that the white men who ally themselves with negroes in this conflict need not expect any better fate than they; fact is, they will be the first to suffer, if the Caucasian can find them at all when trouble comes.

In July, 1875, the Raymond Gazette, whose editor is now a member of the Legislature, and which is published only eight miles from Clinton, where the bloody riot of last September occurred, made this startling demand:

There are those who think that the leaders of the Radical party have carried this system of fraud and falsehood just far enough in Hinds county, and that the time has come when it should be stopped—peaceably if possible, forcibly if necessary. And to this end it is proposed that whenever a Radical pow-wow is to be held, the nearest anti-Radical club appoint a committee of ten discreet, intelligent, and reputable citizens, fully identified with the interests of the neighborhood and well known as men of veracity, to attend as representatives of the tax-payers of the neighborhood and the county, and true friends of the negroes assembled, and that whenever the Radical speakers proceed to mislead the negroes and open with falsehoods and deceptions and misrepresentations, the committee stop them right then and there, and compel them to tell truth or quit the stand.

The Clinton riot was the direct outgrowth of this demand. What follows? The same paper of date July 26, 1876, shows that this vicious policy has been renewed in Hinds county, as follows:

DEMOCRATIC CENSORS.

The county executive committee of the Democrats and conservatives of Hinds county held a meeting at Raymond the other day, at which, on motion, it was ordered that each club in the county appoint a special committee whose business it shall be to attend any and every Radical meeting held in its vicinity, and that each of said committees shall report to its own club and to this executive committee the action, attendance, and general tone and temper of said meeting.

A SYSTEM OF COERCION.

A very general system of coercion was adopted throughout the South by Democratic clubs and associations agreeing not to employ negroes who voted the Republican ticket, not to lease them lands, nor to furnish them with or allow them to obtain for themselves any means of subsistence.

The proofs of this are overwhelming. I read from the Chickasaw Messenger a communication from Buena Vista, Mississippi;

BUENA VISTA, MISS., January 1, 1876.

EDITOR MESSENGER: The following list comprises the freedmen that have been reported by the members of the Buena Vista Democratic conservative club as the one-third that would be refused to recontract for the year 1876. You are requested by the club to publish their names in the Messenger.

Respectfully yours,

C. A. M. PULLIMAN,
Secretary Buena Vista Dem. Con. Club.

"Fred Crow, Frank Williams, Dary Holliman, John Doss, Wade Pulliam, Calvin Gladney, Joe Moore, Henry Johnson, Anderson Williams, Ed. Braintlett, John Pulliam, Ben Valient, Gay Brand, Wash Chandler, Jake Walker, Henry Woodard, Lawson Pulliam, W. Huddleston, Martin Pulliam, Ed. Kvie, Calvin Gray, John Buchanan, Van Punds, Albert Connor, Ed. Nathan, Jim Pulliam, Simon Baskin, Bill Pulliam, George Gates, J. Featherstone, Shadrack Love, Hilliard Fields,

"We are not familiar with the names of all the leading darkies in Buena Vista, but it occurs to us that many of them do not appear upon the list sent to us. We may not understand aright the action of the Buena Vista club, but our impression is that one-third of the laborers were to be discharged, and that one-third should include a turbulent, vicious rascals as Fred McIntosh, Prince Huddleston, and others who once held high carnival in that section. Let us have no whipping the devil around the stump, friends, but let us carry our pledges both in spirit and letter."

HOUSTON, January 1, 1875.

Pursuant to a call of the president, the club met at the courthouse at eleven o'clock a.m., W. S. Bates presiding.

On motion of Captain Frank Burkitt, the following resolutions were read:

1. That we solemnly declare our purpose to stand to and abide by our pledges made during the canvass, and that we will hold in utter detestation any man claiming to be a Conservative Democrat who by any equivocations shall in the least violate the sacred promises made by us previous to the election, either as a club or as individuals.

2. That at no time and under no circumstances will we employ those who are regarded as leaders in the Radical party.

3. That we will not employ any laborer who has been discharged by any member of our club because of his past political course.

4. That the members of this club are requested to send into the secretary the names of all persons turned off by them under the above resolutions, and that the executive committee of the county is requested to publish their names.

5. That every other club in the county is requested to take like action.

6. That our papers are requested to publish these resolutions and the names of persons sent to them by the executive committee.

7. That colored men are invited to join this club.

8. That this club meet the first Saturday in each month.

J. B. GLADNEY, Secretary.
From the Okolona (Mississippi) States, November 18, 1875.]

The Radical party of Mississippi contend that *intimidation* won the White Line victory. It is not the first time, neither will it be the last time in which *intimidation* has been successfully used. The white men have been intimidated in times past, and we wonder which has the best of the bargain. We are so situated that we are obliged to fight the devil with fire. Let the white men not be afraid to intimidate evil-doers. *Intimidation* is legitimate, perfectly legitimate.

Ex-Governor Benjamin G. Humphries, of Mississippi, made a speech at a reunion of the Thirteenth Mississippi Confederate In-

fantry, at Meridian, on the 22d of November, 1875, in which he said:

We have surrendered none of our convictions and still claim the right of vindication. In looking back at our past actions and inactions, and the wrongs we have suffered and are still suffering, we confess that we have no regrets for the choice we made between the "higher-law" license of majorities in the Union and the sacred security of a Government in the States, between the Federal and Confederate governments. We are not conscious of a solitary dereliction of duty, either as citizens or soldiers, and feel that truth, reason, and religion exonerates us from wrongdoing. We know we were right, and though crushed to earth we should ever remember, and teach our children to remember, our cause and glory is just! We are still proud of the cause and glory in the fight we made.

After the election, the Meridian Mercury, of November 20, 1875, says:

We have to contend with the blunder of the fifteenth amendment while it stands as best we can. Ridiculous appeals to the reason and judgment of the negro have been the cause of incalculable injury in the initiation of his vanity and making him believe he was of real consequence as a governing element in the body politic. Now that the negro in this state is down and his personal self-conceit well knocked out of him, it is probably a fit time for the white people to impress upon him that the white people will in future control the politics of this State, and that he should keep himself in his proper sphere and leave to the intelligent white man the exclusive use of statescraft for the best interest of both races. Impress him continually with the idea of his worthiness for the ballot and his proper place on election day away from the polls.

[Here the hammer fell.]

THE CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

MR. SAVAGE. I move that his time be extended.

MR. HALE. I hope that another hour may be given him.

THE CHAIRMAN. That will be the effect of an indefinite extension, to which the Chair hears no objection.

MR. GARFIELD. I could fill many columns of our Record with evidences like those above quoted from the gentleman's own State. In the light of this testimony, is it possible for us to believe that the transformation had occurred in the gentleman's own State in the election of that Legislature that made him a Senator?

If the testimony of the Democratic press of Mississippi is to be credited, the late election in the State of Mississippi was tainted with fraud and managed by intimidation unparalleled by anything in our recent political history. Let the gentleman explain this striking fact: there are many thousand more colored than white voters in the State of Mississippi. In the election of 1873 the Republican party had 22,976 majority; in the election last autumn the Democratic party had a majority of 30,922. How came this change of more than 53,000 in the short space of two years, if there was a free and uncoerced vote of the electors of that State?

The President of the United States has sent

to the Senate a letter addressed by him to Governor Chamberlain, under date of July 26, 1876, from which I read a few words of high official authority bearing upon the point I am now discussing. He says:

The scene at Hamburg, as cruel, blood-thirsty, wanton, impudent, and as uncouthed for as it was, is only a repetition of the course that has been pursued in other Southern States within the last few years, notably in Mississippi and Louisiana. Mississippi is governed to-day by officials chosen through fraud and violence such as would scarcely be accredited to savages, much less to a civilized and Christian people. How long these things are to continue or what is to be the final remedy the Great Ruler of the universe only knows; but I have an abiding faith that the remedy will come, and come speedily, and I earnestly hope that it will come peacefully. There has never been a desire on the part of the North to humiliate the South. Nothing is claimed for one State that is not freely accorded to all others, unless it may be the right to kill negroes and Republicans without fear of punishment and without loss of caste or reputation. This has seemed to be a privilege claimed by a few states.

But it is aside from my purpose to go into the question of the validity of the late election in Mississippi. That subject is being investigated by a committee of the Senate, and I shall be surprised if, from the evidence they have taken, they do not concur in the opinion I have expressed. I desire gentlemen to remember that the great question I am discussing is, had the great transformation taken place among the gentleman's constituents in the late autumn of 1875?

The answer of his own people is overwhelmingly in the negative.

I now ask, had the transformation occurred in the winter and spring of the present year?

I hold in my hand the report of an address of Rev. Taylor Martin, of Charlotte, North Carolina, the town to which Congress lately gave a mint building to be used for school purposes. The address was made on Decoration Day, May 5, 1876. I quote:

The South is to-day ruled over by the miserable thrall of Yankedom; but they cannot muzzle our chivalry and patriotic devotion to the "lost cause." We have fought for our rights, but in God's dispensation we are vanquished, but not cowed. Slavery was a divine institution, and we must have that institution or the South will ever be bankrupt. They speak of our cause as the "lost cause." If so, shall it be lost forever? No! a new generation has sprung up, and at a not far distant day there will be "stars and bars" floating proudly over our sunny South, in the next political campaign we must, even if in the minority, support a Southern man who will build up our interests and hurl the Yankee pick-pockets from our midst. We are to-day united to the puritanical host by an artificial tie; but we are a distinct people, and God and the right will enable us to show to the world the truth and the equity of our claims. Our statesmen now in Congress are the cream of that body, and are the only element that reflects credit on the United States. Is it not better to hang on to the "lost cause" than to stay in a government of corruption?

Mr. YEATES. With the consent of the gentleman from Ohio, I want to state that I

have seen under the signature of the gentleman from whom he has just quoted a statement denying *in toto* every word of what has just been read; and a number of gentlemen who heard the speech certify that the quotation is false in every particular.

Mr. GARFIELD. If that be the fact I will cheerfully strike the extract from my speech. I never before heard it authentically denied.

Mr. YEATES. There is no doubt of the correctness of my statement.

Mr. GARFIELD. Let the extract and the denial stand together. But, sir, I will quote a recent utterance of public opinion, the authenticity of which I am quite sure no gentleman will deny. They will neither deny the ability nor the prominence of Robert Toombs, of Georgia, formerly a Senator and a Secretary of the Treasury. On the 25th of January, 1876, he addressed the Legislature of Georgia by invitation; and the following extract from that speech will show how far the transformation has taken place in him and his followers:

We got a good many honest fellows into the first Legislature, but I will tell you how we got them there. I will tell you the truth. The newspapers won't tell it to you. We got them there by carrying the black vote by intimidation and bribery, and I helped to do it; I would have scorned the people if they had not done it! And I will buy them as long as they put beasts to go to the ballot-box! No man should be given the elective franchise who has not the intelligence to use it properly. The rogue should not have it, for government is made to take care of him! Now, these miserable wretches—the Yankees—have injected five millions of savages into the stomach of our body-politic, and the man who says he accepts negro-suffrage, I say, accursed be he! I will accept everything; I will accept Grant and capture before I will accept such a Democrat! The poor, ignorant negro—talk of him governing you and me! It takes the highest order of intellect to govern the people, and these poor wretches talk of governing us! Why, they can't perpetuate their own negro power. In the countries where they were in the majority they did not preserve their power and perpetuate their rule. My remedy helped us to break that up. We carried them with us by bribery and intimidation. I advised it and paid my money for it! You all know it, but won't say it. But I will say it, for I fear no man, and am prepared to render an account to none but the Great Judge, before whom I must appear in a few years, for my enemies have thought my services to the country so great that they have done me the honor to exclude me from again serving my people. I contest that honor with our chief, Mr. Davis. I am just as good as he is, and he is no better than I am. I demand that they shall place me beside him. I thank them for it. It is very few things that I have to thank them for, but I do thank them for that.

In view of the testimony I have offered, we must wait for an answer to the question, when and where did the transformation occur? It occurred long ago in the philosophical and patriotic heart and mind of the gentleman from Mississippi; but has it occurred in the majority of the eleven millions who joined with him to destroy the Union, to

perpetuate slavery, to defend the cause that is now "lost?"

Had it occurred last week in the town of Meridian, in the gentleman's own State? I quote from the Meridian Mercury of July 29, 1876:

We heard LAMAR's Scooba speech, and while his truth to his beloved South, perhaps, flamed out a little more than crimson, we remarked nothing inconsistent with his other speeches we had heard or read of. The morning of his arrival here the Mercury contained a sharp sting at him about the Summer oration, and that night, at the court-house, he ventured to chastise us sharply for it in the house of our friends, and was boisterously applauded. We consoled ourselves that the applause might have been more in compliment to the excellence of the oratory than in satisfaction at our castigation. We had our revenge, though, in taking which we inaugurated the policy of the canvass in spite of him which carried the State like a prairie on fire. He and others who wanted to dress up in a nice starched and ironed white shirt that would shame the bloody shirt established a laundry at Jackson on the 4th of August, and a great many patronized it and came out in snowy white frocks to present themselves creditably before the Northern public sentiment. In their party pow-wow of that day, disregarding the deep under-current of public opinion, they declared by formal resolution against the White Line policy.

The Mercury had sounded the depths of that under-current, too, we knew it would not do, in heart we felt with the platform, but our judgment assured us that the canvass must be lost on it, and that to practice it were a fatal error. We denounced the platform upon the instant, and took what care we could that LAMAR's speeches upon his national reputation should not ruin our canvass. We called upon the people to "step across the platform" which denatured it, and form the White Line beyond it. The summons was music to their ears, and the unconquered and unconquerable Saxon race of Mississippi rallied to the slogan.

* * * * *

We have got the State; we know how we got it; we know to keep it; and we are going to keep it without regard to race or numerical majority.

Mr. Chairman, after the facts I have cited, am I not warranted in raising a grave doubt whether the transformation occurred at all except in a few patriotic and philosophic minds? The light gleams first on the mountain peaks; but shadows and darkness linger in the valley. It is in the valley masses of those lately in rebellion that the light of this beautiful philosophy, which I honor, has not penetrated. Is it safer to withhold from them the custody and supreme control of the precious treasures of the Republic until the midday sun of liberty, justice, and equal laws shall shine upon them with unclouded ray?

In view of all the facts, considering the centuries of influence that brought on the great struggle, is it not reasonable to suppose that it will require yet more time to effect the great transformation. Did not the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. George F. Hoar] sum up the case fairly and truthfully when he said of the South, in his Louisiana report of 1874:

They submitted to the national authority, not because they would, but because they must. They abandoned the doctrine of State sovereignty, which they had claimed made their duty to their States paramount to that due to the nation in case of conflict, not because they would, but because they must. They submitted to the constitutional amendments which rendered their former slaves their equals in political rights, not because they would, but because they must. The passions which led to the war, the passions which the war excited, were left untaimed and unchecked, except so far as their exhibition was restrained by the arm of power.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LAMAR] says there is no possibility that the South will again control national affairs, if the Democracy be placed again in power. How is this? We are told that the South will vote as a unit for Tilden and Hendricks. Suppose those gentlemen also carry New York and Indiana. Does the gentleman believe that a Northern minority of the Democracy will control the Administration? Impossible. But if they did, would it better the case?

Let me put the question in another form. Suppose, gentlemen of the South, you had won the victory in the war; that you had captured Washington, and Gettysburg, and Philadelphia, and New York; and we of the North, defeated and conquered, had lain prostrate at your feet. Do you believe that by this time you would be ready and willing to intrust to us—our Garrisons, our Phillipses, and our Wades, and the great array of those who were the leaders of our thought—to intrust to us the fruits of your victory, the enforcement of your doctrines of State sovereignty and the work of extending the domain of slavery? Do you think so? And if not, will you not pardon us when we tell you that we are not quite ready to trust the precious results of the nation's victory in your hands. Let it be constantly borne in mind that I am not debating a question of equal rights and privileges within the Union, but whether those who so lately sought to destroy it ought to be chosen to control its destiny for the next four years.

I hope my public life has given proof that I do not cherish a spirit of malice or bitterness toward the South. Perhaps they will say I have no right to advise them; but at the risk of being considered impertinent I will express my conviction that the bane of the Southern people, for the last twenty-five years, has been that they have trusted the advice of the Democratic party. The very remedy which the gentleman from Mississippi offers for the ill of his people has been and still is their bane. The Democratic party has been the evil genius of the South in all these years. They yielded their own consciences to you on the slavery question, and led you to believe that the North would always yield. They made you believe we would not fight to save the Union. They made you believe that if we ever dared to

cross the Potomac or the Ohio to put down your rebellion we could only do so across the dead bodies of many hundred thousands of Northern Democrats. They made you believe that the war would begin in the streets of our Northern cities; that we were a community of shop-keepers, of sordid money-getters, and would not stand against your fiery chivalry. You thought us cold, slow, lethargic; and in some respects we are. There are some differences between us that spring from origin and influences of climate; differences not unlike the description of the poet, that—

Bright and fierce and fickle is the South;
And dark and true and tender is the North;
differences that kept us from a good understanding.

You thought that our coldness, our slowness, indicated a lack of spirit and of patriotism, and you were encouraged in that belief by most of the Northern Democracy; but not by all. They warned you at Charleston in 1860.

And when the great hour struck there were many noble Democrats in the North who lifted the flag of the Union far above the flag of party; but there was a residuum of Democracy, called in the slang of the time "Copperheads," who were your evil genius from the beginning of the war till its close, and ever since. Some of them sat in these seats, and never rejoiced when we won a victory, and never grieved when we lost one. They were the men who sent their Vallandighans to give counsel and encouragement to your rebellion and to buoy you up with false hope, that at last you would conquer by the aid of their treachery. I honor you, gentlemen of the South, ten thousand times more than I honor such Democrats of the North.

I said they were your evil geniuses. Why, in 1864, when we were almost at the culminating point of the war, their Vallandighans and Tildens (and both of these men were on the committee of resolutions) uttered the declaration, as the voice of the Democracy, that the experiment of war to preserve the Union was a failure, and that hostilities should cease. They asked us to sound the recall on our bugles; to call our conquering armies back from the contest, and trust to their machinations to save their party at the expense of a broken and ruined country. Brave soldiers of the lost cause, did you not, even in that hour of peril, in your heart of hearts, loathe them with supremest scorn? But for their treachery at Chicago the war might have ended and a hundred thousand precious lives been saved. But your evil genius pursued you, and the war went on. And later, when you would have accepted the constitutional amendment and restoration without universal ~~suffrage~~ the same evil genius held you back. In 1868 it still deceived you. In 1872 it led you into

A gulf profound as that Serbonian bog
Betwixt Damna and Mount Casius old,
Where armies whole have sunk.

Let not the eloquence of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LAMAR] lure you again to its brink.

Mr. Chairman, it is now time to inquire as to the fitness of this Democratic party to take control of our great nation and its vast and important interests for the next four years. I put the question to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LAMAR] what has the Democratic party done to merit that great trust? He tried to show in what respects it would not be dangerous. I ask him to show in what it would be safe. I affirm, and I believe I do not misrepresent the great Democratic party, that in the last sixteen years they have not advanced one great national idea that is not to-day exploded and as dead as Julius Caesar. And if any Democrat here will rise and name a great national doctrine his party has advanced, within that time, that is now alive and believed in, I will yield to hear him. [A pause.] In default of an answer I will attempt to prove my negative.

What were the great central doctrines of the Democratic party in the Presidential struggle of 1860? The followers of Breckinridge said slavery had a right to go wherever the Constitution goes. Do you believe that to-day? Is there a man on this continent who holds that doctrine to-day? Not one. That doctrine is dead and buried. The other wing of the Democracy held that slavery might be established in the Territories if the people wanted it. Does anybody hold that doctrine to-day? Dead, absolutely dead.

Come down to 1864. Your party, under the lead of Tilden and Vallandigham, declared the experiment of war to save the Union was a failure. Do you believe that doctrine to-day? That doctrine was shot to death by the guns of Farragut at Mobile, and driven, in a tempest of fire, from the valley of the Shenandoah, by Sheridan, less than a month after its birth at Chicago.

Come down to 1868. You declared the constitutional amendment revolutionary and void. Does any man on this floor say so to-day? If so, let him rise and declare it.

Do you believe in the doctrine of the Broadhead letter of 1868, that the so-called constitutional amendments should be disregarded? No; the gentleman from Mississippi accepts the results of the war! The Democratic doctrine of 1868 is dead!

I walk across that Democratic camping-ground as in a grave-yard. Under my feet resound the hollow echoes of the dead. There lies slavery, a black marble column at the head of its grave, on which I read: Died in the flames of the civil war; loved in its life; lamented in its death; followed to its bier by its only mourner, the Democratic party, but dead! And here is a double grave: Sacred to the memory of squatter

sovereignty. Died in the campaign of 1860. On the reverse side: Sacred to the memory of Dred Scott and the Breckinridge doctrine. Both dead at the hands of Abraham Lincoln. And here a monument of brimstone: Sacred to the memory of the rebellion; the war against it is a failure: *Tilden et Vallandigham fecerunt*, A. D. 1864. Dead on the field of battle; shot to death by the million guns of the Republic. The doctrine of secession; of State sovereignty. Dead. Expired in the flames of civil war, amid the blazing rafters of the Confederacy, except that the modern *Aeneas*, fleeing out of the flames of that ruin, bears on his back another Anchises of State sovereignty, and brings it here in the person of the honorable gentleman from the Appomattox district of Virginia, [Mr. TUCKER.]

[Laughter.] All else is dead.

Now, gentlemen, are you sad, are you sorry for these deaths? Are you not glad that secession is dead? that slavery is dead? that squatter sovereignty is dead? that the doctrine of the failure of the war is dead? Then you are glad that you were outvoted in 1860, in 1864, in 1868, and in 1872. If you have tears to shed over these losses, shed them in the grave-yard, but not in this House of living men. I know that many a Southern man rejoices that these issues are dead. The gentleman from Mississippi has clothed his joy with eloquence.

Now, gentlemen, if you yourselves are glad that you have suffered defeat during the last sixteen years, will you not be equally glad when you suffer defeat next November? [Laughter.] But pardon that remark; I regret it; I would use no bravado.

Now, gentlemen, come with me for a moment into the camp of the Republican party and review its career. Our central doctrine in 1860 was that slavery should never extend itself over another foot of American soil. Is that doctrine dead? It is folded away like a victorious banner; its truth is alive forevermore on this continent. In 1864 we declared that we would put down the rebellion and secession. And that doctrine lives and will live when the second Centennial has arrived! Freedom, national, universal, and perpetual—our great constitutional amendments, are they alive or dead? Alive, thank the God that shields both liberty and Union. And our national credit, saved from the assaults of Pendleton; saved from the assaults of those who struck it later, rising higher and higher at home and abroad; and only now in doubt lest its chief, its only enemy, the Democracy, should triumph in November.

Mr. Chairman, ought the Republican party to surrender its tranchon of command to the Democracy? The gentleman from Mississippi says, if this were England the Ministry would go out in twenty-four hours with such a state of things as we have here. Ah, yes! that is an ordinary case of change of adminis-

tration. But if this were England what would she have done at the end of the war? England made one such mistake as the gentleman asks this country to make when she threw away the achievements of the grandest man that ever trod her highway of power. Oliver Cromwell had overturned the throne of despotic power and had lifted his country to a place of masterful greatness among the nations of the earth; and when, after his death, his great scepter was transferred to a weak, though not unilineal hand, his country, in a moment of reactionary blindness, brought back the Stuarts. England did not recover from that folly until, in 1689, the Prince of Orange drove from her island the last of that weak and wicked line. Had she afterward repeat the blunder?

For more than fifty years pretenders were seeking the throne, and the wars on her coast, in Scotland and in Ireland, threatened the overthrow of the new dynasty and the disruption of the empire. But the solid plbgm, the magnificent pluck, the round-about common sense of Englishmen steadied the throne till the cause of the Stuarts was dead. They did not change as soon as the battle was over and let the Stuarts come back to power.

And how was it in our own country when our fathers had triumphed in the war of the Revolution? When the victory was won, did they open their arms to the loyalists, as they called themselves, or tories, as our fathers called them? Did they invite them back? Not one. They confiscated their lands. The States passed decrees that no tory should live on our soil. And when they were too poor to take themselves away, our fathers, burdened as the young nation was with debt, raised the money to transport the tories beyond seas or across the Canada border. They went to England, to France, to Nova Scotia, to New Brunswick, and especially to Halifax; and that town was such a resort for them that it became the swear-word of our boyhood. "Go to Halifax" was a substitute for a more impious, but not more opprobrious expression. The presence of tories made it opprobrious.

Now I do not refer to this as an example which we ought to follow. O, no. We live in a milder era, in an age softened by the more genial influence of Christian civilization. Witness the sixty-one men who fought against us in the late war, and who are now sitting in this and the other Chamber of Congress. Every one of them is here because a magnanimous nation freely voted that they might come; and they are welcome. Only please do not say that you are just now especially fitted to rule the Republic, and to be the apostles of liberty and of blessings to the colored race.

Gentlemen, the North has been asked, these many years, to regard the sensibilities of the South. We have been told that you

were brave and sensitive men, and that we ought not to throw fire-brands among you. Most of our people have treated you with justice and magnanimity. In some things we have given you just cause for complaint; but I want to remind you that the North also has sensibilities to be regarded. The ideas which they cherish and for which they fought triumphed in the highest court, the court of last resort, the field of battle. Our people intend to abide by that verdict and to enforce the mandate. They rejoice at every evidence of acquiescence. They look forward to the day when the distinctions of North and South shall have melted away in the grander sentiment of nationality. But they do not think it is yet safe to place the control of this great work in your hands. In the hands of some of you they would be safe, perfectly safe; but to the hands of the united South, joined with the most reactionary elements of the Northern Democracy, our people will not yet surrender the government.

I am aware that there is a general disposition "to let by-gones be by-gones," and to judge of parties and of men, not by what they have been, but by what they are and what they propose.

That view is partly just and partly erroneous. It is just and wise to bury resentments and animosities. It is erroneous in this, that parties have an organic life and spirit of their own—an individuality and character which outlive the men who compose them; and the spirit and traditions of a party should be considered in determining their fitness for managing the affairs of a nation. For this purpose I have reviewed the history of the Democratic party.

I have no disposition nor would it be just to shield the Republican party from fair and searching criticism. It has been called to meet questions novel and most difficult. It has made many mistakes. It has stumbled and blundered; has had some bad men in it; has suffered from the corruptions incident to the period following a great war; and it has suffered rebuke and partial defeat in consequence. But has it been singular and alone in these respects? With all its faults, I fearlessly challenge gentlemen to compare it with any party known to our politics. Has the gentleman shown that the Democratic party is its superior either in virtue or intelligence? Gentlemen, the country has been testing your qualities during the last eight months. The people gave you a probationary trial by putting you in control of this House. When you came here, in December last, the same distinguished gentleman to whom I am replying addressed you on the evening of your first caucus in these words:

There has been for some time in the public mind a conviction profound and all-pervading that the civic service of the country has not been directed from considerations of public good, but from those of party profit, and for

corrupt, selfish, and unpatriotic designs. The people demand at our hands a sweeping and thorough reform, which shall be conducted in a spirit that will secure the appointment to places of trust and responsibility of the honest, the experienced, and the capable.

That is sound doctrine; and I have advocated it here and elsewhere during the last eight years. I remind him that the pernicious doctrine that "to the victors belong the spoils," is of Democratic origin; that nearly half a century of Democratic tradition and practice has fastened it upon the country. We found it, and have been cursed by it ever since; and though some efforts have been made to reform it, the good work is hardly begun. When, therefore, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LAMAR] as chairman of the Democratic caucus, at the opening of the session, announced the doctrine I have quoted, we had reason to hope that a new era of civil service had dawned upon the Capitol. But what performance has followed his high-sounding proclamation? No sooner did this reforming party take possession of this house than it began the most wholesale, sweeping changes of officials, from the highest to the humblest employees of the House, that has been known in our history. Many of these officers had come to us from our Democratic predecessors; but they were almost all dismissed to give place to hungry partisans. Sixty-seven Union soldiers who were faithfully doing their duties here, were turned out, and among those who filled their places were forty-seven rated rebels.

Mr. WILLIS. May I inquire how many Union soldiers were put in office?

Mr. GARFIELD. I do not know the precise number.

Mr. WILLIS. If the gentleman will institute a comparison he will find that it is decidedly favorable to the Democratic party so far as patriotism and devotion to Union soldiers is concerned.

Mr. GARFIELD. The facts do not bear the gentleman out in his statement. This is the practice which followed your professions of civil-service reform.

Mr. HOLMAN. As a matter of justice and fair play the gentleman from Ohio certainly knows and should admit that a large number of disabled soldiers, whose Republicans are still holding office in this House,

Mr. CONGER. I object to the gentleman from Indiana interrupting the gentleman from Ohio. Let the gentleman opposite give our side an opportunity to be heard for once.

Mr. GARFIELD. I am almost through, and will soon yield the floor.

In answer to the gentleman from Indiana, I understand that a considerable number of Democratic Union soldiers were appointed; but I was discussing civil-service reform and the declaration of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LAMAR] that appointments to office should not be used as party rewards.

I desire to glance for a moment now at the career of this House and at what they have done and omitted to do. Passing by their treatment of contested-election cases, their appointment of officers, employes, and committee-clerks who have reflected no credit upon the House, I desire to ask what valuable work of general legislation has this House accomplished?

We had hardly been here a month, when, among the first things demanded was that in disregard of the deep feelings of the Northern people, it was proposed to crown Jefferson Davis with full and free amnesty, notwithstanding he had contemptuously declared he never would ask for it; and this was to be done, or no amnesty was to be granted to any one. And when we objected because he was the author of the unutterable atrocities of Libby and Andersonville prisons, the debate which followed disclosed the spirit and temper of the dominant party.

We were hardly in our seats when the gentlemen from Virginia [Mr. TUCKER] brought in a bill to repeal a statute of 1863 which no Democrat had before that proposed to disturb, so far as I know; a statute which provided that no man who voluntarily went into the rebellion against the Union should ever hold a commission in our Army or Navy. And a Democrat from my own State, [Mr. BANNING,] the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, became the champion of that bill; and this House passed it.

Again, we had passed a law to protect the sanctity and safety of the ballot in national elections, so that the horrors of the Ku-Klux and the white-linists should not run riot at the polls, and among the earliest acts of this House was a clause added to one of the appropriation bills to repeal the election law; and to effect that repeal they kept up the struggle lately under the fierce rays of the dog-star. They have been compelled by a Republican Senate to abandon the attempt.

Again, what have they neglected? Early in the session, indeed in the first days of it, a proposition was made, introduced by the gentleman from Maine, [Mr. BLAINE,] so to amend the Constitution as to remove forever from the party politics of the country the vexed and dangerous question of church and state by preventing the use of the school funds for sectarian purposes. That amendment was sent to the Committee on the Judiciary to sleep, perhaps to die; for it is said to have been three times voted down in that committee.

Again, the Secretary of the Treasury officially informed us that his power was exhausted further to refund the debt; and that if we would give him the requisite authority he could refund four or five hundred millions more at so favorable a rate as to save to the Treasury at least 1 per cent. per annum of the whole amount. The Senate passed the bill more than six months ago, but this House has taken no action upon it.

Our revenues have been threatened with a deficit and our industries have been shaken with alarm by bills reported to the House but never been brought to a vote; for example, the tariff bill, floating lazily upon the stagnant waters of the House.

As idle as a painted ship
Upon a painted ocean—

a promise to free-traders, a threat of danger to manufacturers, but with no prospect or purpose of acting upon it.

And the Government has been crippled by the withholding of necessary appropriations; withheld, as I do not hesitate to say, for the purpose of making political capital at the coming election, in which the gentleman from Mississippi desires his party to succeed in the name of honesty and reform. His colleague was frank enough to declare that he wanted to reduce the general appropriations, so as to have money enough to devote to some scheme for his section, such as the cotton claims and the Southern Pacific railroad.

But party necessity has held many waiting schemes and claims in leash. They are anchored in the lobbies and committee-rooms of this House, till the election is over. There is the bill to refund the cotton tax to the amount of \$30,000,000, waiting to be launched, when the election is over. A subsidy of a hundred millions upstairs (Pacific railroad committee-room) is waiting to come down upon us for the Southern Pacific railroad, when the election is over. There are \$35,000,000 of private claims, Southern claims, waiting to burst up from the committee-rooms below stairs, when the election is over.

While these things surround us; while the very earth shakes with the tramp of the advancing army of generals who are coming "with the Constitution and an appropriation," the gentleman from Mississippi thinks that as a measure to win the Democratic party ought at once to be brought back into power!

Meanwhile what has been the chief employment of this House? It has divided itself in a score of political parties, in the hope of finding corruption, like those insects that feed upon sickly trees, and upon others that feed upon the corruption of others. Like that scavenger of the air, the carrion bird that buries us back in the rotten carcass, so the Democratic party seeks to fatten on the refuse which it has cast there thrown out of the public service.

This House has adopted eighty-three resolutions of investigation, besides a legion of resolutions of inquiry of the several Departments. Twenty-five standing committees, and eight select committees, up to the 20th of June, in all thirty-three committees, have been making all the slums of the nation, to find, if possible, some savory morsel with which to impregnate the air during the coming election.

And what have they found? Has any one of these committees found that a single dollar has been stolen from the Treasury of the United States? If so, let them declare it. Why, sir, the Republican party for the last three years has been investigating its own Administration far more effectually than you have investigated it. It has had not only the courage of its opinions, but the courage to punish its own rascals.

But, gentlemen, after all that may be said of corruptions and wrong-doing, do you show, on that ground, any good reason why the Republican party should surrender the Government to the Democracy? Would it be better? It is a matter of official record that the Treasury suffered a far greater percentage of loss, by mismanagement and defalcation, under your administration than it has suffered under ours.

In an official letter to the Senate, under date of June 19, 1876, the Secretary of the Treasury copies from his records the aggregate losses by defalcations and the loss per \$1,000 in each period of four years since 1834 in all the Departments and Bureaus of the Government. Without quoting the table at length, the grand aggregate stands thus:

From January 1, 1834, to July 1, 1861, the total disbursements of the Government were \$1,369,977,502.52; the total defalcations were \$12,361,722.51; or a loss of \$9.02 to the \$1,000.

From July 1, 1861, to July 1, 1875, the total disbursements were \$12,566,892,569.53; the total defalcations were \$9,905,245.37; or a loss of twenty-six cents to the \$1,000. In the latter period the disbursements were nearly ten times as great as in the former, and the defalcations one-third less.

Is this country so given over to corruption as the gentleman from Mississippi suggests? I will answer by quoting two distinguished witnesses. In his able speech on the impeachment trial, one of the Democratic managers, the gentleman from New York, [Mr. Loring] said:

Senators, I am one of those who believe in progress. I believe that this age is the best age which the sun has ever shone upon; I believe there is more of religion, more of humanity, more of love, more of charity in this age than in any age that has preceded it.

There is now a higher and healthier sentiment than in any former age. We have held to official responsibilities now, their greatness than they never were before. The time has been in the recollection of many of you who in a person thought he had the right to use his official position for his own advantage; but that time has gone by, and a good deal of what we see and hear, which leads a great many sojourning, truly to say that the age is going backward and we are receding to barbarism, very much which occasions the apparent increase of wrong, arises from the higher demands of a greater civilization from the higher plane of an enlightened people.

Now, I ask the Clerk to read a paragraph which I have marked, from the Centennial address of Rev. Dr. Storrs, a man fit to be the teacher of his race.

The Clerk read as follows:

I soon thought that we as a people are

worse than our fathers, head of the War Department, bitter laments of the corruption which existed in even that infant age of the Republic and of the spirit of venality, rapacious and insatiable, which was then the most alarming enemy of America. He declared himself ashamed of the age in which he lived. In Jefferson's day all Federalists expected the universal dominion of French infidelity. In Jackson's day all Whigs thought the country gone to ruin already, as if Mr. Biddle had not the entire public hope locked up in the vaults of his terminated bank. In Polk's day the excitement of the Mexican war gave life and germination to many seeds of rascality. There has never been a time, not here alone, in any country, when the fierce light of incessant inquiry blazing on men in public life would not have revealed forces of evil like those we have seen or when the condemnation which followed the discovery would have been sharper. And it is among my deepest convictions that, with all which has happened to delase and debauch it, the nation at large was never before more mentally vigorous or morally sound.

Mr. GARFIELD. Now, Mr. Chairman, after all the fearful corruption of his time, described by John Adams, our fathers never thought it necessary to call the tories back to take charge of their newly-gained liberties.

I will close by calling your attention again to the great problem before us. Over this vast horizon of interests North and South, above all party prejudices and personal wrong-doing, above our battle hosts and our victorious cause, above all that we hoped for and won, and you hoped for and lost, is the grand, onward movement of the Republic to perpetuate its glory, to save liberty alive, to preserve exact and equal justice to all, to protect and foster all these priceless principles, until they shall have crystallized into the form of enduring law and become inwrought into the life and the habits of our people.

And, until these great results are accomplished, it is not safe to take one step backward. It is still more unsafe to trust interests of such measureless value in the hands of an organization whose members have never comprehended their epoch, have never been in sympathy with its great movements, who have resisted every step of its progress, and whose principal function has been

To lie in cold obstruction
Across the pathway of the nation.

It is most unsafe of all to trust that organization when, for the first time since the war, it puts forward for the first and second place of honor and command men who, in our days of greatest danger, esteemed party above country, and felt not one throb of patriotic ardor for the triumph of the imperiled Union, but from the beginning to the end hated the war and hated those who carried our eagles to victory.

No, no, gentlemen; our enlightened and patriotic people will not follow such leaders in the rearward march. Their myriad faces are turned the other way; and along their serried lines still rings the cheering cry, "Forward! till our great work is fully and worthily done." [Loud and continued applause.]

0 013 789 571 7

LIBRA



0

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 013 789 571 7

permalife®
pH 8.5